DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 105 736 FL 006 766

AUTHOR Byron, Janet
TITLE Borrowing as a Process in the Standardization of Language.
PUB DATE 74
NOTE 32p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Factors; Culture Contact; *Dialects; Diglossia; Language Patterns; *Language Standardization; *Language Variation; *Lexicology; Nonstandard Dialects; Semantics; Sociolinguistics; Standard Spoken Usage; Syntax; Translation; *Vocabulary
IDENTIFIERS *Word Borrowing

ABSTRACT

This paper suggests that new approaches are needed in the study of language standardization. One such approach is the consideration of standardization in terms of processes, i.e., in terms of series of related events, rather than as a group of unrelated discrete happenings. Borrowing is one recurring feature in language standardization, and in studying language standardization the main task is to determine how the process of borrowing operates on the system that is selected as the base of a standard language, and with what effect. Dialects, foreign languages, writing, translation, and archaic languages are discussed as sources of borrowing. Purism is discussed as a tendency contrary to borrowing. (Author/AM)

ED105736

Borrowing as a Process in the Standardization of Language[1]

Janet Byron

Among recent methodological innovations which have been suggested for Linguistics as a result mainly of work in syntactic theory and in sociolinguistics, two of them, despite their controversial nature, have implications for the study of language standardization. The first concerns the role of induction in Linguistics. Emmon Bach (1965) has characterized Linguistics up to 1957 as largely inductive or Baconian in character, and he suggests that if Linguistics is to continue to make significant progress in the understanding of language, linguistic analysis will have to extricate itself from the too rigorous dominance of empiricism and induction, and allow freer scope for hypothesis and theory. The second innovation is the principle of uniformitarianism, borrowed from geology and introduced by Labov in his essay, "Some principles of linguistic methodology" (1972). In geology, the principle of uniformitarianism is usually expressed figuratively as the maxim, "The present is the key to the past."[2] It is Labov's contention that because of the inevitable inadequacies of historical records, presently observable linguistic processes will have to assist in

---

[1] A shorter version of this paper was delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, December 1974.

[2] The meaning of this simple statement is actually a matter of dispute among geologists themselves. Several years ago the Geological Society of America convened a symposium which was devoted to the question of the meaning and pertinence of uniformitarianism in geology (see Albritton 1967). That aspect of the principle on which there is maximum accord is that natural observable processes can account for past geological change. What is excluded from the principle is the mistaken notion that the actual physical conditions of the past are identical to those of the present.

FL006766

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

interpretation of the past. His application of uniformitarianism to Linguistics is expressed as follows: "the linguistic processes taking place around us are the same as those that have operated to produce the historical record."

While it would be a mistake to minimize the controversy surrounding the issues of induction, uniformitarianism, and related questions, as they are argued in the history and philosophy of science, the issues touched upon by Bach and Labov nevertheless have some relevance to the study of language standardization.

First of all, it has already been acknowledged that standardization of language is not a very well understood phenomenon, although we have several studies of the standardization of individual languages. Another fact of work in this field is that while the majority of recent studies are devoted to the newly developing standard languages of young nations (most of which are non-Western-European and have achieved independence in our own time), the notions we have developed about standard languages have their origin for the most part in the Western European context. There is thus a theoretical discontinuity in our investigations. We are now beginning to feel the pinch of two growing problems in standardization: on the one hand, many unrelated studies, and on the other, no relating studies. One way out of the impasse of over-induction, a way that might also lead first to some understanding of the relation between the separate facts that are already known about old and new standard languages, and secondly to some kind of framework for further research, is for us to begin to explain what we know, or what we want to find out, in terms of processes instead of discrete happenings, and wherever possible, in terms of such

processes as are already familiar in Linguistics. Borrowing is a recurring feature in the standardization of languages. The principal task is to determine how this process operates upon the system that is selected as the base of a standard language (i.e. the "basic standard": Ansre 1971), and with what effect.

Every standard language originates in some pre-existing system; the theoretical tradition usually indicates a social or geographical dialect as the beginning point. Extra-linguistic reasons are often cited for the emergence of a particular dialect as a basic standard. Although the standard begins with some particular dialect, its subsequent history depends on its acquiring structural and stylistic properties which fit it for an expanding range of functions, far greater than those served by the original system from which it sprang. To use Prague School terminology, the system has to be intellectualized; in Ferguson's (1968) terms, "modernized". But since modernization is relative, it should be possible to speak of modernization at any period in the history of a standardizing language.

Modernization of a standard appears to be induced partly through cultural change, including changes in ideology and belief; such change is often stimulated through contact with another culture -- either a nation or a social group. Cultural change can be expressed linguistically as a change in the frequency of different types of discourse (Pande 1965:199-200), or, to use the terminology of British linguistics, in the frequency of certain registers.

In the light of cultural change, the basic system may be felt to be inadequate in one or more respects, and the sense of inadequacy often

motivates borrowing. The sources of borrowing usually distinguished in Linguistics are three: (1) an older stage of the language; (2) a spoken dialect of the same language, and (3) another language.[1] Obviously contact provides conditions for borrowing from another language; but contact is also involved in borrowing from other dialects. In addition, as Greenberg (1964) points out, the speakers of a language may be in contact with their past. This kind of contact will favor the borrowing not only of archaisms, but also of words from a classical tradition. Among the classical traditions affecting the Indo-European standard languages are Sanskrit, Latin, Greek, and Old Church Slavonic. Much language contact is, moreover, mediated through writing; this fact is clearest in the case of classical languages, but it also holds true for contemporaneously existing languages. For this reason, translation is often the context in which borrowing into a standard language occurs. The significance of writing therefore means that readers (including translators), as well as speakers, must be included within the class of possible agents of linguistic change, and hence of language standardization.

A language which enjoys enormous respect in the community will often serve as the source of learned words, or of words having connotations or denotations which are distinct from those of words already in use. In English, we are familiar with the historical role of Latin loans in providing

---

[1] In this discussion I shall be concerned mainly with lexical borrowing which is direct; i.e. not mediated through a third language (indirect borrowing, for example, accounts for many Arabic loans in English, loans which entered English via Latin or another language). I shall also not deal with subtypes of lexical transfer; e.g. borrowings which are outright acquisitions , in distinction to loan translations. However, a fuller treatment of the role of borrowing in language standardization would certainly have to take these subtypes into account.

both learned words and formal lexicon. Sanskrit vocabulary as a similar source of formal words in Indian languages has been noted by Bright and others. Often, the Sanskrit partner in a doublet is a sign of respectful address (on the role of Sanskrit in Indian languages see Killingley 1967). Sometimes differences in denotation are indicated by members of a pair. We learn from R. H. Gower that in Swahili chuo refers to a Koranic school, while the English loan skule or shule refers to a school where Latin characters are taught; and that ngoma designates a traditional dance, while the loanword dansi refers to the Western style of dancing (Gower 1952:154). Old Church Slavonic has provided several members of lexical doublets in Russian; e.g. glava 'chapter' vs. golova 'head'.

Borrowings from two foreign languages provide possibilities for further nuances. French and Latin loans in English are notable in this regard. Triplets consisting of English, French, and Latin words, each having a slightly different shade of meaning, are numerous in English; e.g. goodness, virtue, probity; fire, flame, conflagration (Baugh 1957: 225-226).

The problem of such mates in a new standardizing language is that often they have not been around long enough for a solution to have been reached with respect to their final semantic use. This seems to be the case with English and French words borrowed into Hausa, where doublets like komfanyii or kompanyii (< French compagnie) co-exist with kamfanii < English company (examples cited in Zima 1964). Similarly, in Swahili, 'report' is denoted by both taarifi (< Arabic) and ripoti < English (Gower 1952:154). This situation would appear to be temporary, if we assume that in the normal course of development one member of the pair disappears, or else semantic specialization develops.

The role of classical Indo-European languages in the development of older European standard languages may be similar to that of world languages like English and French in the development of new standard languages. European languages have often drawn on Greek and Latin for nomenclature in areas of science, economics, philosophy, etc. We learn from Paden (1968) that European vocabulary is incorporated into Hausa for the lexicon that deals with modern areas such as administration and law. Many English words have also been borrowed into Swahili to denote distinctively Western concepts in government, medicine, education, and transport (Gower 1952). However, as Greenberg (1964) indicates, the influence of English and French on African languages has been little studied. Once this area has been adequately researched, it should then be possible to determine to what extent the function of classical languages and that of modern world languages are comparable in the history of standard languages.

Translations of scientific and technical words have promoted standardization of language. Erämetsä (1961) has examined the contribution which has been made to German economic vocabulary by German translators of Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations (1776). Erämetsä does not, however, distinguish among the kinds of loan influences that appear in the translations; in many cases, there is no question of an outright loanword, but rather of semantic extension of ordinary German expressions into the economic sphere; i.e. of loanshifts, to use Haugen's (1950) term. The morphemes thus affected become homonymous. Among the economic expressions which entered German through translations were Alleinhandel 'monopoly', Nennwert 'nominal value', Kleinhandel 'retail trade', Handelspolitik,

'commercial policy'. Eighteenth-century English translators of Lavoisier's works on chemistry introduced into English a number of chemical terms; e.g. oxygen, hydrogen, combustion, nitrogen, phosphate, etc. (Mackenzie II, pp. 201, 245-246). Mackenzie (1939) contains a number of sections dealing with the role of English-to-French translations and French-to-English translations in the development of French and English vocabulary, respectively. In modern times, English-to-Swahili translations have introduced many grammatical changes in written Swahili (Harries 1961).

Original works are also a source of borrowing; in the course of presenting new ideas or novel interpretations a writer may introduce words from another speech community. A case in point is Edmund Burke. It was through his political writings, including those on the French Revolution, that a number of political and diplomatic terms entered the English language; e.g. diplomatique (= diplomatic), diplomacy; revolution and revolutionary (in their political senses); democrat; aristocrat; etc. (Mackenzie II, pp. 203-206). Burke knew French, but apparently his speaking knowledge of it was not exceptional (see Cone II, pp. 180-181).

The role of dialectal borrowing and of archaisms is less extensive in the development of a standard language than the role of foreign-language borrowing.

Typically the dialectalisms that enter a standard denote products and features of provincial life. In English, northern dialects have given glen, kilt, clan, and others. In French, the Midi has provided a number of terms such as escargot, abeille and others. Dialectalisms which become widely diffused eventually lose their unusual character, and speakers seem to take their existence for granted.

Dialectalisms may be motivated by structural needs, as the development of Standard Albanian shows.[1] Standard Albanian is based on the southern (i.e. Tosk) dialect of Albanian, but it has borrowed a number of features of Geg. One of these is the Geg technique of forming adjectives meaning, commonly, '-able'. For example, the Tosk form for 'believable' is i besuar, the Geg form i besueshëm; it is the latter which is standardized, for the meaning noted. The motivation of the borrowing lies in certain semantic deficiencies of Tosk; a form like i besuar is actually ambiguous: it means both 'believable' and 'believed' (past participial adjective); the Geg form, in contrast, is unambiguous. As a result of standardization, Tosk i besuar is prescribed for the meaning 'believed' and the Geg borrowing i besueshëm for 'believable'. It is interesting that Hebrew has had a similar problem with respect to ambiguous Hebrew expressions denoting possibility (see Blanc 1957:406-407). Weinreich (1953:59) cites several instances in which semantic under-differentiation motivated borrowing and subsequently lexical specialization.

A common feature of dialectalisms and archaisms is that some negative motivation sometimes underlies their use. Pressure to use these forms may be the result of purism, i.e. reaction against excessive borrowing from foreign languages. This is particularly noticeable in the development of new standard languages, where it is not unusual for a hierarchy to be established with respect to preferred sources of loans. The favored sources of new words are, in order of preference, native dialects, including non-standard and archaic ones; genetically related languages; and last of

---

[1] This and other illustrations pertaining to Albanian are more fully developed in Byron (in prep.).

all, foreign languages which are not genetically related to the receiving language. However, it is often difficult to abide strictly by this hierarchical criterion. All too often very little is known about the dialects of the language or about its earlier stages, and this lack of knowledge thwarts utilization of internal resources. A problem may even be posed by the attempt to resort to genetically related languages. In Swahili, for example, Bantu languages are preferred to non-Bantu languages as sources of borrowings (Broomfield 1930, Weston 1965). But the difficulty of relying on Bantu is that like Swahili, other Bantu languages are often themselves not so well developed that they can be looked to for needed words; or else it is not clear what contributions these other languages can make, since they have not been thoroughly studied (cf. Weston 1965:8). A language like Swahili is therefore obliged to borrow from non-related languages -- among which Arabic has been a traditional source -- and lastly, from other Western languages, especially English.

In older standard languages purism may also motivate dialectalisms or archaisms; but in addition, the literary atmosphere may encourage such borrowing. During the French Romantic Movement many writers, struck with medieval nostalgia, revived a number of words and subjects which had become obsolete. Many of these words became current in Standard French; e.g. fabliau, geste ('heroic deed'), macabre, ménestrel ('minstral'), etc. (Deroy 1956:116). Many other archaisms, however, are not generalized; because of their ornamental character, they may remain the property of a small literary class, and thus not greatly affect the standard language. They may even be short-lived in the work of a particular author. For example, in revising his work, Ronsard, who was remarkably tolerant of linguistic innovations, eliminated many innovations, including archaisms,

from his revisions. The same was true of several of his literary contemporaries (Lebègue 1964; Rickard 1968:19).

When structural, as opposed to lexical archaisms are introduced into a standard language their effect is to arrest a spontaneous development. We learn from Lockwood (1956) that in spoken Faroese the genitive has nearly disappeared completely. But the preference of writers for the archaic led to an artificial revival of this case in written Faroese. In Estonian, according to Kurman (1968), the essive case had ceased to be productive by the mid-nineteenth century, but it was re-introduced into Literary Estonian under the influence of Finnish and with the support of two Estonian language reformers.

Borrowing from an older stage of the language ought, I think, to be regarded as a special instance of borrowing from another register of that language (cf. Ward 1971:174, where the archaic is defined as a feature of register). For example, the development of Hebrew as a standard language has necessitated not only borrowing from foreign languages, but also, of course, borrowing from older registers of the language; i.e. Biblical and post-Biblical literature (Blanc 1954). Other instances of registral borrowing include the numerous Standard French expressions which have come from thieves' slang; e.g. argot, fourbe 'sly', larbin 'flunky', etc. (Deroy 1956:128-129; Ewert 1943:301). Other such borrowings include hunting terms used figuratively (e.g. béjaune 'young bird; greenhorn'), terms from pre-modern medicine (e.g. bilieux, flegmatique), and from astrology: contrecarrer, lunatique, etc. (on special borrowings of this type, see Deroy 1956:117-121). There are numerous expressions in Standard Russian which derive from the argot of criminals (Unbegaun 1950:35).

It is usually assumed that a standard language accepts only usage which is typical of the social or intellectual élite of a speech community and rejects all other dialectal influence. This is not always true. The change of French /we/ to /wa/ in words which are now pronounced /wa/ as in roi and the change of French /ɫ/ to /j/ in words like fille are believed to be due to popular Parisian influence. These changes were fought by the grammarians, but without success (Hall 1974:201; Ewert 1943: 61-62, 87-88). In Standard Albanian, which is based on the Tosk dialect, there are several traces of Geg dialectal influences in phonology and morphology. In this case, however, the grammarians have been receptive of the changes and have found reasons why they ought to be standardized. The majority of Gegisms, however, are rejected. For the influence of popular London speech on Standard English, see Matthews (1937).

The problem of constraints on borrowing will be considered below, after the following discussion concerning diffusion of a standard language. Diffusion involves borrowing out of the standard language; it constitutes a special instance of language learning.

The system in which a standard originates will remain simply a literary dialect, as long as it does not enjoy widespread, usually national, use. It becomes standard through diffusion into areas or functions in which some other dialects were previously used, and through a corresponding narrowing in the functional scope of the competing dialects. We are already aware of standard-language learning as a phenomenon of the contemporary cultural life of older nations. However, the learning of a preferred dialect is also an aspect of the standardization of a language. Although indications of the preferred status of a dialect are customarily sought in explicit

historical statements, long before any such statements are made or attested, we may find evidence of dialectal preference in diffusion of the preferred dialect into geographical areas and into types of discourse where it had not previously been used, where another native dialect was the rule. The first unambiguous statement attesting to the acceptance of London English as standard dates from 1490, with Caxton. However, long before this, we find diffusion of London forms of speech (for example such forms as are found in Chaucer) used outside their customary territory. This diffusion required contact with educated speakers of London itself; sometimes contact was mediated through writing. Some of the conditions which led to it have been pointed out by Henry Cecil Wyld (1937). They include: (1) the study of official London documents by scribes, lawyers, and other officials, (2) the popularity of Chaucer, and (3) dissemination of London speech as a result of printing. Residence of other dialect speakers in the capital itself would also favor direct contact between dialects. All of these factors would create diglossia, if a writer of a different dialect area adopted the London form of speech in his writing. A case in point is provided by John Gower, a contemporary of Chaucer. Gower was a native of Kent who had spent some time in London. The custom of writing in a number of dialects was still well established in his time, but the use of London English by English writers was gradually increasing, as we find in Gower's case. Gower was trilingual, he wrote in English, French, and Latin; in his English work, Confessio Amantis, written around 1390, we do find indications of Gower's Kentish origin, but on the whole, the language of this work agrees with what has been observed in the London dialect of the time, with what is found, for example, in Chaucer. As a native of Kent, Gower would naturally have known such forms as an -eth

ending in the plural indicative of the present, where in London, and in Chaucer, forms in -en were the rule. The contrast would be between, e.g. bindeth and binden. In Kent, too, present participles ended in -ind(e) rather than -end(e) or the innovative one -ing(e); in Kent, people said heo, rather than she, for 'she'; hi instead of thei for 'they', and they often voiced initial f- and s-, saying for example vader instead of fader for 'father'. But in Confessio Amantis Gower chose all the London forms rather than the Kent ones. These facts about his language are all familiar, but it is only since Ferguson (1959) that such linguistic behavior can be given the name of diglossia.

Sometimes it is possible to find traces of the act of learning in the record. As is well known, the East Midlands adopted the northern form -es in place of its historical form -eth as the ending of the 3d sg. present indicative. In London people stopped saying cumeth for 'he comes' (cumeth was the normal form in Chaucer), and they began saying cumes. By the late 16th century, innovative forms like cumes became more common, in prose, at least, except in the case of the auxiliaries hath and doth, which survived a while longer (Wyld 1937; Bambas 1947). This means that there was a time when people were learning (borrowing) more and more -es and unlearning (abandoning) -eth. This is traceable in the lives of some individuals. We have it on Wyld's (1937) evidence, for instance, that in the correspondence of Queen Elizabeth I, the letters she wrote as a young girl show fewer instances of the innovation -es, while in letters she wrote during the last years of her life, instances of -es are more common. Evidence of the learning of Standard German appears in successive editions of the Zwingli Bible (the first version of which appeared in the early 16th

century), in which each succeeding version shows fewer marked dialectal (Alemannic) and more standard characteristics (Langen 1952:1092-1093; Henzen 1954:111 ff.). One of the most important replacements entailed change of the old long vowels ī, ū, ǖ to the diphthongs ei, au, and eu, respectively. Similar replacements have continued to attend the diffusion of Standard German (see Moser 1954:91).

In ordinary language learning, it is recognized that the native speech habits of the learner modify his performance. The individual's mastery of the speech to be learned will depend to a large extent on the degree of what is called interference. Historically, there are parallels to this situation in textual criticism, where it is widely recognized that a scribe, in copying down a text in a dialect which is different from his own, will rarely copy it exactly as it is; traces of his own speech tend to creep in. In standardization a similar phenomenon occurs in the course of the diffusion of a standard, where it appears to contribute to regional forms of a standard -- provided the modifications are widespread. There is evidence that in the history of a standardizing language, the native dialect modifies the learning of the standard, so that the standard is not learned with the degree of assurance found among individuals whose geographical or social origin is closer to the linguistic source of the standard. The situation with respect to English (i.e. Received) has been touched on by a number of scholars (e.g. Wyld 1934, 1937), although much remains to be explained here. The situation with respect to Standard French is less well investigated, although we have studies by Auguste Brun, Jean Séguy and a few others. One conspicuous development in the modification of Standard French, especially as it is diffused far from its northern source, is that in many provincial dialects of the Midi, there are no nasal vowels, so that

in speaking French the inhabitants will substitute the sequence vowel + nasal for a nasalized vowel. In other places such as Toulouse, as reported by Séguy (1950), final stops are often articulated where they are lost in Standard French. For example, one might say estomac with final -k, instead of /estoma/. Standard French is based on a northern dialect as originally spoken in the Ile-de-France. The earliest shape of this dialect is not entirely clear, but by the 13th century many literate Frenchmen who were born outside the area were already feeling linguistically on the defensive. The establishment of diglossia as a result of the continued diffusion of Standard French has often been indicated, although it is customarily called bilingualism by earlier French scholars such as Brunot (VII, 1926:319-320).

Standard forms diffuse at the expense of marked (rejected) dialectal forms of speech. Spoken dialects show a noticeable decline, even though these dialects may, as earlier noted, contribute certain constituents to the standard language. Moreover, the social fate of dialects may be reflected in various ways in literature. The ways in which functional restriction or obsolescence of non-standard forms is evidenced include channel (e.g. confinement to oral, rather than written discourse); genre (e.g. poetry rather than prose; comedy, rather than tragedy); style (informal, rather than formal discourse); or social level (uneducated, rather than educated speakers). From the earliest period in the emergence of Standard German, dialect began to be used, in literary works,for the speech of the lower classes, while the upper classes spoke Standard German; or dialect would appear in comedies. Romance languages evidence a similar use of marked dialectal features to special genres, such as comedy and satire (Hall 1974). The Standard English verbal affix -es diffused at the expense of -eth, which became confined to poetry, elevated discourse (e.g. liturgical

writing), and to the auxiliaries hath and doth, before it finally became obsolete. Moreover, during the transitional period during which the change had not yet been completed, the alternation between -eth and -es provided fresh possibilities for metrical and rhythmical variation (Bambas 1947). As a result of diffusion of Standard Albanian (based on Tosk), Geg has become restricted to poetry and to the speech of northern Albanians; in fictional works, dialectal use is sanctioned for the speech of the older generation, while Standard Albanian is prescribed for younger characters. When dialect speakers learn a standard language, it may even be difficult for them to retain adequate competence in their original dialect. Labov has observed this characteristic in American English. "We have not encountered any non-standard speakers who gained good control of a standard language and still retained control of the non-standard vernacular" (Labov 1970:52). This effect of standard-language learning may account, in part, for the general decline of spoken dialects, which has been noted by several observers (e.g. Martinet 1954:6, Haugen 1968:274).

Returning to the problem of borrowing into the standard: there are constraints on the freedom with which one language borrows from another. As we learn from historical linguistics, lexical borrowing is easier than structural borrowing. Nothing in standardization contradicts this. This is why the lexicon (particularly that sub-class of it which includes content words, in distinction to function words) will loom large in any consideration of the role of borrowing in standardization. In addition, as is pointed out in some studies of borrowing (e.g. Deroy 1956:212), nouns are more readily borrowed than adjectives and verbs. This fact suggests that the development of adjectives and verbs, in distinction to nouns, might necessitate greater (though not exclusive) reliance upon other processes

than borrowing -- for example, upon derivation, including back formation, semantic change, and functional shift, but this hypothesis would have to be substantiated. A large number of French nominal loans, for instance, have been functionally expanded to verbs in English, and this is the source of such English verbs as to catalogue, to lecture, to silence, to tutor, etc. (on functional change in English, see Lee 1948). Not only should we consider the possible differences in the processes involved in developing different categories within a given language, but we should also take note of constraints which may differ across languages. Functional conversion, for instance, is probably much more likely to be common in the lexical development of a language like English, which has lost so many inflections, and comparatively rare in a language like German, which remains highly inflectional.

Syntactic influence of one language on another (i.e. borrowing a syntactic pattern from another language) has often been pointed out; e.g. the influence of Latin syntax on European standard languages. However, it is not always easy to be sure, in syntax, whether any given case is a true case of borrowing or of convergent development. For example, many modern European languages are evidencing an expansion of nominal constructions at the partial expense of verbal ones; i.e. verbs are segmentalized. The type is illustrated, for example, in German: er erklärte 'he explained' may be replaced by er gab die Erklärung ab, lit. 'he offered an explanation' (example from Moser 1954, which includes a general discussion of the problem). Typological pressures may also make it difficult to attribute some particular pattern to borrowing from a specific language. It is a well known fact that one of the features of the Balkan Sprachbund is that the languages in this linguistic area share a future-tense type formed by a

desiderative particle followed by a finite verbal form (Sandfeld 1930). Albanian, as a Balkan language, possesses this type (e.g. do + të shkruaj 'I shall write'), but it also has two other future formations. Albanian language authorities have standardized the future form which is shared by other Balkan languages and have reserved the other future forms for special stylistic use; standardization, in this instance, evidences submission to typological pressures of the surrounding area.

How can we reconcile borrowing as a process in the standardization of language with purism, which is an attempt to prescribe obsolescence? The explanation lies in the fact that purism, like borrowing, is selective in various ways.

Just as language cultivators are often more kindly disposed to some loan sources than to others (cf. above, pp. 8-9), they may be more hostile to some languages than to others, so that loans from less favored sources may come under attack during periods of linguistic self-consciousness. Neustupný (1965:90) has suggested that the degree of hostility towards loans varies in proportion to the extent the borrowing society is culturally or politically dependent on the lending society. This explanation is valid for Albanian, in which there is less opposition to Slavic and Greek loans than to Turkish loans: the cultural backwardness of Albania is often attributed to centuries of Turkish domination. Turkish loans thus frequently bear secondary connotations of inadequacy and cultural weakness. In the Turkish language movement, on the other hand, there has been stronger opposition to Arabic and Persian loans than to European (French, English) loans. The latter are in general more consistent with the Turkish policy of modernization; they are also considered less threatening from the linguistic point of view, since they are fewer in number and thus do not compromise the

individuality of the language (Heyd 1954:77-78).

Purism may also be historically selective in the sense that at various periods in the history of a standardizing language, different languages, rather than the same ones, come under attack. In the 18th century, Spanish Academies objected mainly to French loanwords, but later they shifted their opposition to English loanwords (Guitarte and Quintero 1968).

Purism is also selective in that only known loanwords are singled out for special attention. In most languages there are loanwords which have become so thoroughly assimilated to the language that they are either unrecognized or are accepted as native. Some loans may also be indispensable to the receiving language for various reasons, among which semantic and stylistic enrichment must be included (cf. earlier discussion of this point). Despite anti-Turkish purist movements in the Balkans, the Balkan standard languages retain a number of Turkisms which carry stylistic values ranging over neutral, poetic, historical, colloquial, pejorative, etc. (Kazazis 1972).

Finally, selective purism may be evidenced in opposition to lexical rather than structural influences; it is generally upon the area of vocabulary that purists direct their attack, since it is primarily vocabulary rather than structure which evidences external influence. Even here, however, purists may object not to this influence as such, but rather to what they regard as excessive external influence.

Since borrowing and purism are contradictory tendencies, purism may indicate a disavowal of former attitudes. Thus, while borrowing may express a positive sense of indebtedness to another culture, the emergence of purism signifies that many individuals in the speech community have come to regard this indebtedness as a sign of unworthy dependence. Again, while borrowing may signal the receiving culture's ascription of prestige to the

lending culture, purism may indicate a re-affirmation of the receiving culture's own value. This is why nationalist movements, which are assertive of indigenous values, are frequently the historical context in which puristic campaigns are waged. But because purism is selective, it does not entirely negate contributions made by borrowing.

In Prague School theory (Garvin and Mathiot 1960, Havránek 1932, Mukarovský 1932), standard language is analyzed with respect to three linguistic and extralinguistic characteristics. On the one hand, we have the linguistically intrinsic properties of a standard language and, on the other, the extra-linguistic factors of standard-language functions (which are correlated with certain attitudes towards the standard language): standard language promotes unification of a speech community, and it also serves as the measure of correctness. These characteristics assist in further elucidation of the role of borrowing in standardization.

Borrowing into the standard develops intrinsic properties of a standard language; whereas borrowing out of it (i.e. diffusion of the standard language, standard-language learning) promotes standard-language functions and speech-community attitudes towards the standard (language loyalty, feeling of pride).

Intellectualization is the property which is most enhanced by borrowing into a standard language. This property refers to the capacity of a standard language to express all kinds of themes, ranging from conversational and familiar to technical and scientific: a standard language must be capable of appropriation to all registers. Since, however, folk speech (i.e. non-standard spoken dialects) lends itself as well as standard language to conversational and to some "workaday technical" registers, it is primarily in the area of scientific registers (including,

broadly, pure science, mathematics, philosophy, etc.) that we should expect to find linguistic capabilities which are missing in folk speech; here, according to Prague doctrine, the standard language must permit accuracy of expression, in accordance with the rigor of scientific thinking. Additional facets of intellectualization include refinement of semantic and stylistic differentiation; increase in abstract and generic terms; and development of word-forming techniques and complex syntactic devices. Intellectualization affects primarily the lexicon, but to some extent grammar too. The lexical examples previously cited (pp. 4-10) suggest, in part, how lexical borrowing promotes the intellectual capabilities of a standard language. With respect to science, the contribution of Greek and Latin (words and affixes) to European scientific scientific vocabulary has been amply documented. Greco-Latin borrowings have been partly motivated by the search for terminological accuracy and clarity. In English, the practice of drawing upon classical sources for scientific terms became established in the 16th century. After experimenting with archaisms, coupling (use of a loanword followed by an explanatory synonym in the native language), and new creations, scientific writers finally became convinced that formations derived or borrowed from Greco-Latin were generally better than their alternatives. The alternatives were often awkward, confusing, or -- in the case of Anglo-Saxon archaisms -- no longer intelligible (see Johnson 1944). To a certain extent, then, classical borrowings were employed faute de mieux. In newer standard languages, which draw on such older standards as English, French, and Spanish for scientific terms, there is likewise a tendency for direct loans from these languages to be used when other solutions fail (see, e.g. Del Rosario 1968). However, other motives besides clarity may induce the

choice of Greco-Latin terms. Intellectual exclusivism sometimes underlies the preference: it was argued by some proponents of classical loans that if scientific or technical concepts were expressed in native terms, these subjects would then become intelligible to the masses; individual language cultivators in both England and France evinced this attitude (see Johnson 1944; Brunot I, 1924:516). Motives for borrowing may therefore be mixed, and it remains to be determined how much weight is accorded some legitimations over others, in particular cases. In considering the role of any process, including borrowirg, in promoting accuracy of scientific language, one is necessarily faced with the problem of the meaning of accuracy in science. Although accuracy or precision has theoretically been prescribed for scientific language. in actuality, much vagueness has often permeated scientific nomenclature. Moreover, it is even questionable whether absolute accuracy is either possible or necessary in scientific discourse (Kent 1958 examines this question). In evaluating the appropriateness of various techniques of word development, one must therefore distinguish between actual and possibly ideal properties of scientific discourse. Some attitudes of language authorities may betray naive or mistaken notions about the nature of scientific language.

If borrowing into a standard language promotes its inherent properties, borrowing out of it promotes first its symbolic function of linguistically unifying a speech community and secondly, its objective function as a frame of reference for defining correctness and deviation. The first of these functions -- standard language as an interdialectal medium of communication -- has often been indicated; all that need be added is the fact that diffusion of the standard language is the way in which this unity is brought about. The second function -- standard language as a yardstick of correctness and

deviation -- requires some elaboration. The notion of standard language as "the best language" actually implies a qualification: best for certain purposes, and in certain situations defined by the speech community itself. There is no instance of a speech community, or its language authorities, prescribing one system of communication as normative for all possible types or occasions of discourse. Nevertheless, it appears that once a language begins to develop a standard form, any usage which then contrasts with it may be re-interpreted as deviant, rather than neutrally different, and this deviant usage thus becomes available for aesthetic or poetic exploitation (Garvin and Mathiot 1960, Mukarovský 1932). The Prague notion of foregrounding is relevant here. Havránek defined foregrounding as "the use of the devices of the language in such a way that this use itself attracts attention and is perceived as uncommon ... (Havránek 1932:10). The retreat of marked dialectal forms as a result of language standardization thus makes these forms capable of foregrounding in certain ways (cf. Mukarovský 1932:25). A problem of research, however, arises here, and it is to determine the literary transformation of dialects, the modification of their aesthetic potentialities, before and after a language begins to standardize. I previously pointed to the literary constriction which marked dialectal features undergo as a result of standardization, but there is certainly more to be said on the subject. (For one treatment of the question, see Craigie 1938.)

The effect which borrowing has on the standard base is to modify the phonotactic properties and co-occurrence relations which formerly held for the base. Latin influence on French, via orthography, introduced (or re-introduced) a number of atypical consonant clusters into Standard French; e.g. /lpt/ as in <u>sculpture</u>; some Greek loans

introduced the sequence /mn-/ (Hall 1974:149-150). Borrowing of the Geg reflexive pronoun (i vetë) in Standard Albanian has made such a formerly acceptable (and ambiguous) Tosk sequence as e pa nënën e tij 'he saw his mother' less acceptable than the now standard e pa nënën e vetë, where 'his own' (e vetë) mother is meant. The reflexive pronoun, moreover, is losing its dialectal and social distinctiveness as it is diffused across dialect boundaries by way of the standard language. Disappearance of such markedness is comparable to a more general sociolinguistic phenomenon, in which a particular variant loses its social value, once it has won out over its rival alternates and been adopted by the speech community at large (cf. Labov 1970:77).

The question of the role of borrowing in standardization, and particularly of borrowing from another language, can be reformulated as an inquiry into the role of bilinguals, or of bilingualism, in the standardization of language -- although there is still some disagreement as to the degree of bilingualism which is required in order for certain borrowings to occur. Language contact is thus the sociolinguistic context in which language standardization ought to be studied: bilingualism presupposes some degree of language contact, and so does diffusion of a standard language. Moreover, contact may be mediated through the written word.

It would be useful, in conclusion, to note some problems which arise in an attempt to define the role of borrowing (into) the standard language. We have noticed that some extraneous influences are rejected, while others are accepted; this applies equally to foreign, archaic, and dialectal borrowing. Thus the behavior or attitude towards language is

variable; in Fishman's terms: some instances of interference are viewed as pernicious and unnecessary, while others are treated as acceptable and desirable (cf. Fishman 1964:63-64). One of the major problems is to try to establish, if possible, the reasons for this distinction in any particular phase of language standardization. For older standard languages much of the relevant historical data is undoubtedly irrecoverable. But for newer standard languages, it is possible, to a certain extent, to study the activities of language planners directly (see, e.g. Das Gupta et al, 1972). However, historical understanding of the motivations for borrowing (as surveyed, e.g. by Weinreich 1953) should inform the study of borrowing in language standardization. In addition, the effect of social change should be taken into account: transformations of social structure may induce a modification in the notions of correctness and may create an environment favorable to influences which were previously repelled. Hall indicates that the rise of a middle class after the French Revolution led to relaxation of traditional linguistic standards and to a shift in the basis of norms; features which were previously unacceptable began to penetrate Standard French (Hall 1974:201). Social changes created by the Russian Revolution likewise intensified, for a time, the influence of rejected idioms on Standard Russian (Unbegaun 1950:35).

It would also be useful to determine the relative weight accorded borrowing vs. its alternatives (new creation, semantic extension, etc.), and the relative weight accorded one type of borrowing over another, in any particular phase of language standardization.

Finally, in evaluating the relative role of various processes in language standardization, it is necessary to give attention not only to

extra-linguistic constraints such as purism, nationalistic tendencies, the willingness to cultivate language, etc., but also to structural properties and historical tendencies of the standardizing language, which encourage or discourage certain types of linguistic manipulation. In this way we will come to understand the extent to which language can be deliberately changed. Nevertheless, there will probably always remain room for debate with respect to individual developments in a standard language. For example, there is a difference of opinion as to whether in his translations Caxton borrowed words with the intention of enriching the English language, or whether he was simply trying to do the best possible job as a printer and translator (Blake 1969:140). I think, however, that we should distinguish between intention and effect. Standardization of language is an effect, which may or may not come about as a result of the intention of a particular individual; his activities may, however, contribute to the linguistic outcome.

REFERENCES

Albritton, Claude C., Jr. (ed.)
1967 Uniformity and simplicity: a symposium on the principle of the uniformity of nature. Geological Society of America, Special paper No. 89.

Ansre, Gilbert
1971 "Language standardization in sub-Saharan Africa." Current trends in Linguistics, Vol. 7. Edited by Thomas Sebeok. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 680-698. Reprinted in Advances in language planning. Edited by Joshua Fishman. The Hague: Mouton, 1973, pp. 369-389.

Bach, Emmon
1965 "Structural linguistics and the philosophy of science." Diogenes 51, pp. 111-128.

Bambas, Rudolph C.
1947 "Verb forms in -s and -th in early modern English prose." Journal of English and Germanic Philology 46, pp. 183-187.

Baugh, Albert C.
1957 History of the English language, 2d ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Blake, N. F.
1969 Caxton and his world. London: Andre Deutsch.

Blanc, Haim
1954 "The growth of Israeli Hebrew." Middle Eastern Affairs, Dec. 1954, pp. 385-392.

1957 "Hebrew in Israel: trends and problems." The Middle East Journal, Autumn 1957, pp. 397-409.

Broomfield, G. W.
1930 "The development of the Swahili language." Africa 3, pp. 516-522.

1931 "The re-Bantuization of the Swahili language." Africa 4, pp. 77-85.

Brunot, Ferdinand, and Charles Bruneau
1905-1969 Histoire de la langue française. Paris.

Byron, Janet
Selection among alternates in language standardization: the case of Albanian. The Hague: Mouton (in preparation)

Cone, Carl B.
1957 Burke and the nature of politics, 2 vols. University of Kentucky Press.

Craigie, William A.
1938 "Dialect in literature." Essays by divers hands 17, pp. 69-91.

Das Gupta, J., C. Ferguson, J. Fishman et al
1972 Language planning processes, draft report. International Research Project on Language Planning Processes. Stanford, California: Stanford University.

Del Rosario, Gonsalo
1968 "A modernization-standardization plan for the Austronesian-derived national languages of Southeast Asia." Asian studies 6:1, pp. 1-18.

Deroy, Louis
1956 L'emprunt linguistique. Paris.

Erämetsä, Erik
1961 Adam Smith als Mittler Englisch-deutscher Spracheinflüsse. Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Series B, 125. Helsinki.

Ewert, Alfred
1943 The French language, 2d ed. London: Faber and Faber.

Ferguson, Charles A.
1959 "Diglossia," Word 15, pp. 325-340. Reprinted in Language in culture and society. Edited by Dell Hymes. New York: Harper and Row, 1964, pp. 429-439.

1968 "Language development." Language problems of developing nations. Edited by Joshua A. Fishman, Charles A. Ferguson, and Jyotirindra Das Gupta. New York: John Wiley and Sons, pp. 27-35.

Fishman, Joshua A.
1964 "Language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry." Linguistics 9, pp. 32-70.

Garvin, Paul L.
1959 "The standard language problem -- concepts and methods." Anthropological Linguistics 1:2, pp. 28-31. Reprinted in Language in culture and society. Edited by Dell Hymes. New York: Harper and Row, 1964, pp. 521-526.

_____, and Madeleine Mathiot
1960 "The urbanization of the Guarani language -- a problem in language and culture." Men and cultures. Edited by Anthony F. C. Wallace. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 783-790. Reprinted in Readings in the sociology of language. Edited by Joshua A. Fishman. The Hague: Mouton, 1968, pp. 365-374.

Gower, John
The complete works of John Gower, 4 vols. Edited by G. C. Macaulay. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899-1902.

Gower, R. H.
1952 "Swahili borrowings from English." Africa 22:2, pp. 154-157.

Greenberg, Joseph
1964 "The study of language contact in Africa." Symposium on multilingualism. London, pp. 167-175.

Guitarte, Guillermo L., and Rafael Torres Quintero
1968 "Linguistic correctness and the role of the academies in Latin America." Current trends in Linguistics, Vol. 4. Edited by Thomas Sebeok. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 562-604. Reprinted in Advances in language planning. Edited by Joshua A. Fishman. The Hague: Mouton, 1973, pp. 315-368.

Hall, Robert A., Jr.
1974 External history of the Romance languages. New York: American Elsevier.

Harries, Lyndon
1961 "Some grammatical features of recent Swahili prose." African language studies, 2, pp. 37-41.

Haugen, Einar
1950 "The analysis of linguistic borrowing." Language 26, pp. 210-231.

1968 "The Scandinavian languages as cultural artifacts." Language problems of developing nations. Edited by Joshua A. Fishman, Charles A. Ferguson, and Jyotirindra Das Gupta. New York: John Wiley and Sons, pp. 267-284.

Havránek, Bohuslav
1932 "The functional differentiation of the standard language." Reprinted in A Prague School reader on esthetics, literary structure, and style. Edited and translated by Paul L. Garvin. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press, 1964, pp. 3-16.

Henzen, Walter
1954 Schriftsprache und Mundarten, 2. Aufl. Bern.

Johnson, Francis R.
1944 "Latin versus English: the sixteenth-century debate over scientific terminology." Studies in Philology 41, pp. 109-135.

Kazazis, Kostas
1972 "The status of Turkisms in the present-day Balkan languages." Aspects of the Balkans: continuity and change. Edited by Henrik Birnbaum and Speros Vryonis, Jr. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 87-116.

Kent, William
1958 "Scientific naming." Philosophy of Science 25, pp. 185-193.

Killingley, D. H.
1967 "The role of Sanskrit in the modernization of the languages of India." The modernization of languages in Asia. Edited by S. T. Alisjahbana. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, pp. 296-307.

Kurman, George
1968 The development of written Estonian. Indiana University Publications: Uralic and Altaic Series, 90. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Labov, William
1970 "The study of language in its social context." Studium Generale 23, pp. 30-87.

1972 "Some principles of linguistic methodology." Language in society 1:1, pp. 97-120.

Langen, A.
1957 "Deutsche Sprachgeschichte vom Barock bis zur Gegenwart." Deutsche Philologie im AufriB, Bd. I, 2. Aufl. Edited by W. Stammler. Berlin.

Lebègue, Raymond
1964 "Flux et reflux du vocabulaire français au XVI^{e} siècle." French and Provençal lexicography: essays presented to honor Alexander Herman Schutz. Ohio State University Press, pp. 219-226.

Lee, Donald W.
1948 Functional change in Early English. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Publishing Co.

Lockwocd, W. B.
1956 "Literary language and dialect in Faroese." Archivum Linguisticum 8, pp. 129-134.

Mackenzie, Fraser
1939 Les relations de l'Angleterre et de la France d'après le vocabulaire, 2 vols. Paris.

Martinet, André
1954 "Dialect." Romance Philology 8, pp. 1-11.

Matthews, William
1937 "The vulgar speech of London in the XV-XVII centuries." Notes and queries, Vol. 172.

Moser, Hugo
1954 "Entwicklungstendenzen des heutigen Deutsch." Deutschunterricht 6, pp. 87-107.

Mukarovský, Jan
1932 "Standard language and poetic language." Reprinted in A Prague School reader on esthetics, literary structure, and style. Edited and translated by Paul L. Garvin. Washington, D. C.:Georgetown

University Press, 1964, pp. 17-30.

Neustupný, Jiri V.
1965 "First steps toward the conception of 'Oriental languages'." Archiv Orientální 33, pp. 83-92.

Paden, John N.
1968 "Language problems of national integration in Nigeria: the special position of Hausa." Language problems of developing nations. Edited by Joshua A. Fishman, Charles A. Ferguson, and Jyotirindra Das Gupta. New York: John Wiley and Sons, pp. 199-213.

Pande, Govind Chandra
1965 "The life and death of languages." Diogenes 51, pp. 193-210.

Parsons, F. W.
1964 "Some observations on the contact between Hausa and English." Symposium on multilingualism. London, pp. 197-203.

Rickard, Peter
1968 La langue française au seizième siècle: étude suivie de textes. London: Cambridge University Press.

Sandfeld, Kristian
1930 Linguistique balkanique. Paris.

Séguy, Jean
1950 Le français parlé à Toulouse. Toulouse.

Unbegaun, B. O.
1950 "Colloquial and literary Russian." Oxford Slavonic papers I, pp. 26-36.

Ward, Dennis
1971 "Diachrony and register: an aspect of the study of contemporary language." Forum for modern language studies 7, pp. 170-182.

Weinreich, Uriel
1953 Languages in contact. Linguistic Circle of New York (and The Hague: Mouton, 1968).

Wyld, Henry Cecil
1934 The best English: a claim for the superiority of Received Standard English. The Society for Pure English, Tract No. 39.

1937 A history of modern colloquial English, 3d ed. New York: E. P. Dutton.

Zima, Petr
1964 "Some remarks on loanwords in modern Hausa." Archiv Orientální 32, pp. 522-528.